



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,035	05/17/2007	Dierk Schoen	WEBE-0019-US	5088
23550 7590 10/09/2009 HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC 75 STATE STREET 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207				
EXAMINER ROGERS, DAVID A				
ART UNIT 2856		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 10/09/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/597,035

**Applicant(s)**

SCHOEN, DIERK

**Examiner**

DAVID A. ROGERS

**Art Unit**

2856

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2006.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 83-179 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 83-95, 109, 111-114, 117-123, 125, 126, 131, 132, 134-143, 150-168, 170-173 and 175 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 96-108, 110, 115, 116, 124, 127-130, 133, 144-149, 169, 174 and 176-179 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (F.T.O. 552)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/7/06, 2/7/07, 9/16/09  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (F.T.O. 413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The specification is objected to for the following:

a. Page 1 - paragraph 1; Page 7 - paragraph 24: these paragraphs should be removed in their entirety as the final claims may not represent the stated claim numbers.

b. Page 2 - paragraph 6: the term --teach-in-- is not a standard term. It is requested that this term be replaced with --learning step--. The remainder of the specification is replete with the phrase --teach-in--. It is requested that all instances be replaced with the phrase --learning step--.

c. Page 12 - paragraph 45, 46: the term --dUZ-- should be replaced with --ΔUZ-- to be consistent with the remainder of the specification.

d. Page 13 - paragraph 47: the value  $3 \times 10^4:1$  probably is a typographical error. Perhaps the applicant intended to write  $3 \times 10^4:1$ .

e. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is more than one paragraph in length. See MPEP § 608.01.

f. In addition to the above the rather lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 149 and 157 are objected to because of the following informalities. In claim 149 the phrase --one of the-- on line 1 is not required. In claim 157 the dependency is from claim 150. The limitations suggest that the dependency should be from claim 155. Appropriate correction is required.

***Double Patenting***

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 83-95, 109, 111-114, 117-123, 125, 126, 131, 132, 134-143, 150-157, 158-168, 170-173, and 175 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-11, 18-27, 34, 36-41, 44-46, 48-60, 62, 69-76, 78-85, and 86 of prior U.-S. Patent No. 7,526,969. This is a double patenting rejection.

5. In addition to the above, claims 83-95, 109, 111-114, 117-123, 125, 126, 131, 132, 134-143, 150-157, 158-163, 166, 170-173, and 175 of this application conflict with claims 71-95, 97, 98, 106-126, 127-135, 138-141, and 143 of Application No.

Art Unit: 2856

10/597,028. The provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.78(b) state that, when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 96-108, 110, 115, 116, 124, 127-130, 133, 144-149, 169, 174, and 176-179 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID A. ROGERS whose telephone number is (571)272-2205. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (0730 - 1600). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron E. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2856

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David A. Rogers/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2856